228

Previous references.

Ex. File. 12-07

1908—9

(Sep: Revs)

File No. 16—08

Serial Nos. 1—4

Later references.

S.R. 159-05: Sh 10 B. Feb 10

SR 35-11 Sh 1-5 B may 12

S.R. 40-16 Sh 1 to 2, B. Sept 1916

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. 1—4

Part B. for February 1909

SUBJECT.

Sripadakala Swami Mutt's claim to the toddy excise revenue of Kangalli and Chimali villages, D-Kanarapur

1) From the Excise Comm^r No. 559 & 18/2/09 for reasons given states that the claim may be allowed

2) To the Excise Comm^r No. H.S 20 & 1/3/09 Calls for further report on the claim.

3) From the Excise Comm^r No 1619 & 4/8/09 Remits the records & states that Kangalli contains only a shop & rules 2, 3, 5 & 12 apply to it & that Chimali Contains neither a shop nor a grove and that no compensation under Rule 13 is necessary

G. R. S. 58

4) To the Excise Comm^r & Comptroller No. H. 3777—9 & 23.2.09. in respect of Kangalli &

G.R.S. 11] 1908.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

(802)

NOTES.

File No. 16-08

FILE HEADING.

Sri Parakalaswami Mutt's claim to the todh revenue of Karegalli and Chimmali villages, T. Narsipur Tk

From The Excise Comr in Mysore

No. 559 Dated 11/7/08 Received 14/7/08

Diary No. 210 | Enclos. 1 file | Spare Copies | Serial No. 1

BRIEF ABSTRACT OF LETTER.

Referring to the opinion of the Mysore District Officer who investigated the claim & the Excise Comr states that the claim may be allowed as the claim in respect of 5 other villages granted under the same Sanad as the villages now in question has been allowed by Govt &c

NOTES AND ORDERS.

1 The investigating Officer Mr H. Sitaramaiah, Excise Asst Comr & the Excise Comr are of opinion that the claim is not allowable as the Sanad Concedes only "each

NOTES—First sheet

GPB—30,000—3-4-07.

Serial No.

Jairoo It is also contended that Seedi is not included in the limits of the village Mr Reese Comp has argued at length in the letter under disposal before the above decision of the investigating officer dtd 6/ Comp is incorrect & not acceptable

2 The Manager Alienation has it may be clear contended the Govt presence to the merits & under rule 18(3) of the rules of 2nd. Accept of this has to be adhered to.

S

3. Of the 2 villages Karagelli is said to be in the letter under disposal to have both & Shed & Magrove but the investigating officer relying upon the Inspectors report states that it has only a Shed Mr Agent on the other hand states that there is no Shed but it has a Grove. As regards the other village Chinnakeli the Manager & Govt admits

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

GPB—50,000—18-5-08

Serial No.	
	Head Head is neither a Shop nor a grove in it & the investigating Officer has accepted this statement from the Excise Comr. States in the letter under disposal that there is a grove in it — From the record it is not possible to find out the exact state of affairs.
4	Sd/- illegible 27.7.08
5	Issued 29.7.08
2	To the Excise Comer. M. 5-20 d. 1-8-08. Requesting that definite informations may be ascertained and reported.
3	From the Excise Comer No 16(2) d. 4/8/08. Regarding the record & states that Kareegalli Cond. only a Shop. that rules 2,3,52 1/2 apply to it, that Chinnaiah contains neither a Shop nor

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

GPB—50,000—13-5-08

Serial No.

a Grove & Head is no Consequential under rule 13 is necessary. Also state Head he should the exact of the proof to the Remainder of Free Tax under rule 12.

b As Karaga Ile has only a Shed rule 6 also should apply to it if the Claim is allowed.

7 In the Case where Mr. Narain Rao the Agt Coorg should the exact of proof to the Remainder the Direction on Govt. Trees to be fixed for the Mean Shed.

8 The same question has been raised by the Dy. Comr of Mysore in respect of the Claims of the Yelleendur Palegar & of the Kattenpura Village. J. Narasipur Talch. The former is pending with the Coorg Comr and in the latter the same Mr. Narain Rao has offered some explanation in deviation of the Coorg Govt

454
SH 39-08 sent to Dy Comr 4/8/08
Sent on 4/8/08
to Dy. Comr on 24/8/08

GPB—50,000—13-5-08

Serial No.

raised by the Collr.
9 It may be noted that
several claims have been
allowed under this rule
and even payments have
already been made in some
cases. 7 It is a point for
consideration how far
it will be advisable to
~~Cancel~~ Cancel the rule now
ruled for orders
thro'
C.S. 8/8/08

10 Please put up a draft
recognising the right of
the Inamdar to the Excise
revenue from liquor of
the Kavagalli village. 1

The Inam Settlement Officer has conceded 'Shendi'.

Rule 19 requires proof
of enjoyment within the
12 years preceding 1892-3 &
not for all the twelve years.
There being neither a
shop nor a grove in
Chanali, nothing is
payable to the Inamdar
in respect of this village
and this fact may also

GPB—50,000—13-5-08

Serial No.

be mentioned in the Order.

11 As regard the propriety or Equity of payment to privileged Inamdars, under rule 12, of tax on trees belonging to Govt or other Inam Villages, tapped for the Supply of Toddy Shops, please see note on the Kheltinpur Claim Case. Govt have decided that tax on trees also is payable to Inamdars, in addition to Shop-rent, evidently because these two items together are taken to Constitute the Excise revenue from Toddy alienated to Inamdars. As for adjustment of true tax bet.n Govt and Inamdars the Principles of locality of Consumption & reciprocity have been accepted for regulating it.

Yours truly

Drafted for Councillor. 22/8/08

Note—Contn. sheet.

25/8/08 Draft, altered and

GPB—50.000—13-5-08

Serial No.

Acd approved - [Better please put up a clean copy of the draft.] Sd/-
6/2/09

1 Please put up a clean draft as approved by the Councillor and then Submit to Dewan
4/2/09. Sd/-

Clean draft submd
K.S. 8.1.09.

9/2/09. Sd/-

To Dewan

11530/9-1-09

Draft appd

Issue

19.2.09. Sd/- 19-2-09

4 To the Secretariat, Bangalore.

No. 3777-9 dated 23.2.09.

Recognises the claim in respect of the Kavagalli village & disallows it in respect of the Bhimali village.

GPB—50,000—13-5-08

210 SR 1

No. 559 / Revn

OFFICE OF THE EXCISE COMMISSIONER IN MYSORE.

DATED BANGALORE, 11th July 1908.

From

M. Narain Rao Esquire,

Excise Commissioner in Mysore.

1608.

(1)

To

K. S. Chaandrasekhara Iyer Esquire B. A. B. L.,

Secretary to the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore,

General and Revenue Departments.

1. Chinali
2. Dodda Gowdana Koppal.
3. Sarangi
4. Gondagere
5. Kodichalli
6. Kargalli
7. Kollahalli
8. Kalledevan halli.

Sir,

I have the honor to state that under a sannad dated 2nd. January 1817 His Highness the late Sri Khrishnaraja Wodeyar ---- Bahadur granted to Bramhathanthra Sri Parakalaswamy's Mutt the marginally noted villages as sarvamanyam. The sannad allows the Swamy to enjoy all items of revenue including, Kadaramba, Niraramba, Tota, Tudike, Ane, Achakattu, Magga, Mane, Jalikuta, Samayachara, Eachalapairu, Sunka, ponnu etc.,

2. In Government Proceedings No. 717-19/Ex.F. 12-01 dated 20th June 1903, the Mutt has been held to be entitled to the Excise revenue from toddy of the villages entered in the margin on the ground that the sannad and the Inam title deeds concede the item of toddy revenue to the Inamdar. It has been presumed that the Inamdar has been enjoying the revenue for 12 years prio to 1892-93.

1. Dodda Gowdana Koppal
2. Sarangi
3. Gondagere
4. Kodichalli
5. Kollahalli

3. The records of enquiry relating to the claim to the Excis revenue from toddy of Kargahalli and Chinali villages in the T. Narsipur Taluk were received under cover of the Deputy Commissioner's memo No. 2266, dated 9th April 1908 through the Revenue Commissioner. The investigating Officer and the Deputy Commissioner are of opinion that the Inamdar is not entitled to the toddy revenue on the ground that the sannad confers only right to "eachalpairu", that no revenue from shendi is included in the beriz which forms the assets of the grant; that the evidence adduced for the enjoyment of toddy revenue is defective in the e

the case of Karagahalli village; and that in the other village, namely, Chimali, no Excise revenue has ever been realised. It is also observed by the investigating Officer that in the adinterim title deed filed in the records, the toddy revenue is conceded.

4. It must be remembered that all the eight villages were grar -ed by the same sannad and when the Government in their order cited in para x supra held that the sannad conceded toddy revenue to the Inamdar, it was no other sannad that was alluded to than the one now filed in the records. When "eachalpairu" in those cases was interpr -ed to mean toddy revenue, there is no reason why it should be construed otherwise in the case of the villages now in question. Besid the interpretation is quite in accordance with what has been decide in the case of Hariharpur, Sivansamudram and other villages. The term here also occurs along with other taxes and duties. Considerin the person to whom the villages were granted, namely, the Swamijee of His Highness himself, and the purpose for which it was granted, namely, for puja, uthsava etc., to Haigreeva Lakshmi Narayana Devro in the Mutt, there cannot be any doubt that they were given without any reservation of any right to Government. It is therefore evident that the Inamdar is entitled to the Excise Revenue from toddy of the villages under the terms of the sannad.

5. To remove all doubts copies of the Inam register of enquiry of the villages were called for and are enclosed in the records. At the Inam settlement conducted in the year 1880 shendi has been conce -ed to the Inamdar in the case of both the villages. In accordance with clause 3 of rule 18 of the rules of the 2nd. August 1901, the Inam settlement and the title deed should be the starting point and since shendi has been conceded the Inam settlement should be adhered to. There is no reason why we should go beyond this and even if we go to the sannad it is clear from what has been said in para 4 supra that the excise revenue from toddy of the villages has been conceded to the Inamdar

6. Now coming to the question of enjoyment, here also it must be remembered that Government when they decided that the Inamdar was

was entitled to the Excise revenue from toddy of the five villages noted in the margin of the first para, presumed that the Inamdar was in the enjoyment of the revenue for twelve years prior to 1892-93. Instances are not wanting in which Government have been pleased to make such presumptions in the case of Mutts and certain other villages. It is but reasonable that such concession should be shown to the villages now in question also especially when in the case of the five other villages granted by the same sannad the enjoyment has been presumed. In the case of Karagahalli village, the Inamdar has actually adduced evidence of enjoyment of the right since 1870. Much stress has been laid by the investigating Officer on the non-production of the evidence of enjoyment for the period of three years from 1884-1887! The enjoyment contemplated by rule 19 does not involve the production of strict proof of enjoyment in each and every year of the twelve years comprised in the prescribed period. Satisfactory proof embracing the said period as a whole is all that can reasonably be expected and insisted upon.

7. In these circumstances, I hold that the Inamdar is entitled to the Excise revenue from toddy of Karagalli and Chimali villages. There is both a toddy shop and a date grove in the former and the case therefore falls under rules 2,3,5,9 and 12 of the rules of the 2nd. August 1901. In the latter village there is no toddy shop and it falls under rules 2,3,5,and 13.

8. The records together with a copy of the investigating Officer's letter and the Inam registers of the villages are herewith submitted for reference.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient Servant,

for Offg. Excise Commissioner.

G.R.S. 26]

File No. 88/16
Serial No. 2

Diary No. of letter replied to 210

General and Revenue Secretariat
(SR)
, *the* 190 .

No. H 520
1st August 08

To The Collector
Coimbatore

Date of issue 1st August 08

Signed By Illegible

Sir,

In returning the enclosures of your letter No 5598 of 11/7/08 regarding the Pardahalasya Mudali's claims to the Todar revenue of Karapalli & Chinnamalai villages, T. Narasipuram Taluk, I am directed to observe that it is not clear from the records, the precise relation these villages bear to

over.

SUBJECT.

5

the record contains
contradictory statements
regarding the existence,
of sledges & graves in
the village. I am therefore
requested, that definite information
in this matter may be
definitely ascertained & reported
with reference to the
Schedules of sledges
from 1892-93 and the
Settlement record of the W.
years of the said Parish
by Steen, wherein these
villages have sledges
& graves or either of them.

I write in your
letter the Statement
that there
Ranagalla has
both a Mosque &
a grave & the
Chunia a grave (this
grave (the
case being brought
under the Investigation
Officer Sabaragamuwa
of Ratnapura)

that there
is only a
Mosque in
Ranagalla &
neither a Mosque
nor a grave
in Chunia

List of enclosures.

Copied by

Examined by 31/7

I would
29/7

2 Recd.

MGCPB—30,000—16-2-05

1514 6

Ex 616

Office of the Excise Commissioner
in Mysore,

No. 1619
1711

Dated Bangalore, 4th August 1908.

From

M. Narain Rao, Esquire,
Offg: Excise Commissioner, in Mysore.

To

K. S. Chandrasekhara Aiyar, Esqr., B.A., B.L.,
Secretary to the Government of His Highness the
Maharaja of Mysore. General & Revenue Depts.

Sir,

Adverting to your letter No.Fl.520/S.R.16-08-2, dated 1st Instant regarding the existence of shops and groves in Sarvamanya Karagalli and Chimali villages of the T. Narsipur Taluk, I have the honor to state that in Karagalli there is no date grove but there is only a toddy shop. The statement that this village has both a toddy shop and a date grove is a mistake. The case of this village therefore, falls under Rules 2, 3, 5 and 12 but I have my own doubts as to the equity of the payment to the Inamdar under Rule 12, of the tree-tax levied on trees situated in Government villages.

2. As regards the village of Chimali, there is neither a shop nor a grove in it. As Rule 13 can only be applied to cases in which there are toddy yielding trees, I am of opinion that the Inamdar is not entitled to any compensation as regards this village.

3. The records are herewith returned.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

M. Narain Rao

Offg: Excise Commissioner.

No. 2266.

District Excise Office
Mysore
Dated 30th March 1908.

From:
H. Seetharamiah Myore
District Excise Officer
Mysore

To
M. Kanthraj Urs, Esquire B.A.
Deputy Commissioner
Mysore District

Sir,

I have the honor to forward herewith the records of enquiry, with sketch, into the Claim of the Inamdar to the Loddy revenue of Karaghalli and Chunali Villages in the T. Narsipur Taluk together with Calendar disallowing the Inamdar's Claim to the Excise Revenue from Loddy thereof for favor of approval and transmission to the Excise Commissioner through the Revenue Commissioner in Mysore.

2. The facts of the Case are that these Villages were granted as Sarvamanyam to the Srimath "Brahmatantra Parakala Mutt by His Highness the late Maharaja Sri Krishnaraja Wadayar Bahadur by means of a Sanad of the 2nd January 1817, Conceding the item of Tachalpa to the Mutt, the Claim of which to Shanbhog was admitted in the Inam Enquiry Register Sheet No. 82

3. Title deed was not produced but the Inamdar produced an ad-interim Certificate No. 59913 dated 31st December 1887 which Conceded the item of Loddy to the

Inamdar

Iraundan.

4. As regards proof of enjoyment the following documents for 12 years prior to 1892-93 were produced.

a A Copy of Muchalikka dated 2nd July 1881 by Mess/s Dasy Nundappa & Co for the years from 1st April 1881 to 31st March 1884.

b. An extract from Cash account of the Inutt proves the receipt of the Swasi devem from Karagalli Village for the years from 1st April 1887 to 31st March 1890 and from 1st September 1891 to 31st March 1892. The Iraunda has admitted before the District Swasi Officer that he has no proof for the period of the enjoyment from 1884 to 1887.

c. The Mer Copies of the Muchalikkas produced by the Iraundar show his Enjoyme for 11 years prior to 1881.

5. (a) There is only a toddy Shop in Karagalli Village Vide T. Narasipur Range Inspectors Report No: 596, dated 27th January 1908. There is neither a toddy shop nor a date grove in Chunali.

(b) The Iraundar's agent. Kempachar has admitted before the Nanjangud Assistant Commissioner on 22nd November 1906 that the Inutt has to get nothing from Chunali Village on account of the Swasi devemne.

6. In Karagalli, it is observed from the

Records.

records that the Anandava has given proof of uninterrupted enjoyment for only 7 years prior to 1892-93 and for the other 6 months enjoyment after a break of nearly a year and a half.

The Sannad confers only right to Kachal for Rs. Revenue from Shendi is included in the kist which forms the assets of the grant, as noted in the Inam Register. The proof of enjoyment of this revenue is defective and is not full and adequate. He has not even established his enjoyment for 12 years prior to 92-93 though a case like this will be required to prove 50 years enjoyment. Under these circumstances I have allowed the Inamdar claim only under rules 4, 8 and 16 of Government Proceedings No: 2074-83-R-7-166-92 dated 2nd August 1901

I have etc

(Sd) H. Sethuramiah

Actual Inam Officer

Mysore

"Copy"

Under Secretary

to Government

Inam Commissioner

[illegible]

Calendar of a claim to today's Revenue Enquiries instituted by the

T. Narasimha.	1	Name of Taluk
Sosale.	2	Name of Hobli
Karagahalli and Chimali.	3	Name of Inam Village
Srimath Bramhathanthra parakal Swami matt.	4	Name of Inamdar
1 Copy of Sanad dated 2nd January 1817. 2 Copy of Ad-interim certificate No: 59913 dated 31st December 1880. 3 Copy of Inam Register Sheet No: 82. 4. Copy of muchalika dated 2nd August 1870 from Captain R. N. Taylor & Co from 1870 to 1875 5 Copy of muchalika dated 21st September 1876 from Messrs Brown Reehmal & Co from 1-4-75 to 15-5-79. 6 Copy of muchalika dt 6/10/79 by W. Smith & papanna Nanjegowda & Co for 16-5-79 to 31-3-81. 7 Copy of muchalika dt 2-7-81 by Messrs Davy muddappa & Co from 1-4-81 to 31-3-84. 8 An Extract of Cash account shewing the receipts of Excise Revenue from 1-4-87 to 31-8-89 1-9-89 to 31-3-90 and 1-9-91 to 31-3-92. 9. T. Narasimha Range Inspector's Report No: 596 dated 27.1.08. 10 Inamdars agent's Statement of the 4th January 1908 before the District Excise Officer Mysore. 11. Agent Rangachar's Statement dt 22-9-06 before the Assistant Commissioner Nanjangud Division.	5	Documents relied upon
Rangachar.	6	Witnesses Examined.
The Inamdar is not entitled to the Excise Revenue from toddy but is entitled to claim under rules 4, 8 and 16 of Government proceedings No: 2074-83-9-7-166-92 dated 2nd August 1901.	7	Finding
As per this office advance Register, an advance of Rs 19-3-6 was paid to the Inamdar on 23-10-96. The Amount to be repaid to the Inamdar or to be recovered from him will be ascertained after the claim is settled by Government.	8	Amount awarded, if any, for last 12 years.

Dated 30th March 1908.

District Excise officer Mysore.

Q fD

omds of decision.

ese Villages were granted to Srimath Bramhathanthra parakal Swami mutt
His Highness the late Maharaja Sri Krishnaraja Wadayar Bahadur by
eans of a Sanad of the 2nd January 1817 which conceded Sehalhyem to the Inamdar.
e Title deed was not given but an ad-interim certificate no: 59913 dated
th December 1880 was produced in which the item of toddy is conceded to
e Inamdar.
- the Inam Enquiry Register Sheet No: 82, the item of Shendi has been
ferred to the Inamdar.
here is only a toddy shop in Karaga halli village. Vide T. Narasimha
ange Inspectors report No: 596 dated 27-1-08, but in Chimali there is
either a toddy shop nor a date grove. The Inamdar does not press
is claim for Excise Revenue in Chimali. Vide Agent Rangachar's
tatement dated 22-9-06 before the Assistant Commissioner Nanjangud
division.
o regards proof of enjoyment, the Inamdar has produced mucharikas
o: 6 and 7 noted in col: 5 which establish the Inamdar's enjoyment
f Excise Revenue for 4 years from 31st March 1880 to 31st March 1884.
he other mucharikas for the remaining 8 years were not produced
ut an extract of the Inamdar's cash account was presented which
hows the receipt of Excise Revenue from this village for 3 years and
a half from 1-4-87 to 31-3-90 and from 1-9-91 to 31-3-92. The Inamdar
has further stated that he has no other references for the receipt
f these Excise revenue for the remaining years.
t is observed from the records that the Inamdar has given proof

G.R.S. 28]

File No. 16-08

Serial No. 4

Train draft.

Diary No. of letter replid to 514

Proceedings of the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

(S.R)

, the 190

Date of issue

Signed by

READ.—

Correspondence, ending with letter, no. 1619 dtd 4-8-08, from the Sheristadar in Mysore, submitting the record of enquiry relating to the claim of the Sri Purakala Mutt to the Sheristadarship of Kanagalli & Shimmali villages, d. Narsipur Taluk:

~~ORDER THEREON.~~ No.

order thereon::

The 2 villages Kanagalli & Shimmali above referred to together with 6 other villages were

over

No 3777-9

23-2-09

SUBJECT

granted to the mutt
under a Sanad dtd
2nd Jan: 1817 by His Late
Highness Sir Krishnaraj Wodeyar
Bahadur. The Sanad
alienates "each & firm" in addition
to several other items of revenue.
The Last Settlement
conducted in 1880 has
clearly conceded the Taddy
Excise Revenue to the mutt
in respect of these villages.
2. In the purposes of the
question now under disposal,
it is necessary to deal with the
two villages separately, as they
are not contiguous and are far apart.
3. There has been proof of
enjoyment of Taddy Revenue
in respect of Kanagandalli village
the 12 years previous to 1932-33
as required by rule 19 contained
in the G.O. dtd 2nd August 1916
Pate therefore held conceding

G.R.S. 27]

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

(*Continuation Sheet draft form.*)

with the Sheristadar and differing from the Investigating officer & the Board, that the Mutt is entitled to the toddy Sheristadar revenue of the Karaggalli village. The case would fall under rules 2, 3, 5, 6 & 12 as there is only a Shop & no grove in the village.

4) There being neither Shop nor grove in the Velimmalai village and consequently no enjoyment of toddy Rev:, no amount is payable in respect of the village to the Mutt.

Print.

Sent to pat:

To the Sheristadar, returning the records.

The Comptroller to pat.

The Inam Supdt.

K.S. 9/11/09

Proceedings of the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore, Financial (Separate Revenue), dated 23rd February 1909.

READ—

Correspondence ending with letter No. 1619, dated 4th August 1908, from the Excis Commissioner in Mysore, submitting the record of enquiry relating to claim of the Si Parakala Mutt to the Excise Revenue from toddy of Karagalli and Chimali village T.-Narsipur Taluk.

No. FL. 3777-9—S. R. 16-08-4, DATED BANGALORE, 23RD FEBRUARY 1909.

ORDER THEREON:—The two villages Karagalli and Chimali above referred t together with six other villages were granted to the Mutt under a Sannad, datec 2nd January 1817 by His late Highness Sri Krishnaraj Wodeyar Bahadur. Th Sannad alienates "eachal piru" in addition to several other items of revenue The Inam Settlement conducted in 1880 has clearly conceded the toddy excis revenue to the Mutt in respect of these villages.

2. For the purposes of the question now under disposal it is necessary to deal with the two villages separately as they are not contiguous and are far apart.

3. There has been proof of enjoyment of toddy revenue in respect of Karagalli within the twelve years previous to 1892-93 as required by Rule 19 contained in the Government Order of the 2nd August 1901. Government, therefore, hold (concurring with the Excise Commissioner and differing from the investigating Officer and the Deputy Commissioner) that the Mutt is entitled to the toddy excise revenue of the Karagalli village. The case would fall under Rules 2, 3, 5, 6 and 12 as there is only a shop and no grove in the village.

4. There being neither shop nor grove in the Chimali village and consequently no enjoyment of toddy revenue, no amount is payable in respect of the village to the Mutt.

C. S. BALASUNDARAM IYER,
Offg. Secy. to Govt., Gen. & Rev. Depts.

To—The Excise Commissioner in Mysore, returning records.
The Comptroller in Mysore.
The Inam Superintendent.

Exd.—C. R.

1908-09

GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS
THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE

FINANCIAL
SEPARATE REVENUE

PROCEEDINGS

ated 23rd February 1909

No. Fl. 3777-9
S. R. 16-08-4

Allowing the claim of the Sri Para-
a Mutt to the Excise Revenue from
ldy of Karagalli and Chimali villages
Narsipur Taluk.

GPB—11-6-09—200